REMARKS

The Office Action dated December 28, 2005, has been received and carefully considered. Reconsideration of the outstanding rejections in the present application is respectfully requested based on the following remarks.

Anticipation Rejection of Claims 1-4, 12, 16-18, and 24-26

Claims 1-4, 12, 16-18, and 24-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(b) as being anticipated by Nakamiya (U.S. Patent No. 6,166,609). This rejection is hereby respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites "a rectifier comprising an input coupled to the oscillation output, and a reference output to provide a rectified signal." This element is not disclosed or suggested by Nakamiya. The Office Action states that this element is disclosed by item 30 of FIG. 1 of Nakamiya. With respect to this element, Nakamiya teaches that element 30 is a " switching element 30 for blocking the output at the output stage of the signal inversion amplifier 20." *Nakamiya*, col. 6, lines 38-40. Nakamiya futher teaches that "the output-blocking switching element 30 is provided in the output stage of the signal inversion amplifier 20 of this embodiment so that, when the transistor 40 is controlled to be off, this output-blocking switching element 30 is also used to provide off-control." *Id*, col. 6, lines 46-53 (emphasis added). In view of this description, the Office Asserts that the element 30 is a rectifier under the overly expansive definition of rectifier as "a device that corrects incoming [sic] signal." *Office Action*, p. 2. Applicant respectfully submits that the Office Action's understanding of the term "rectifier" is in error.

For the Office's reference, a number of exemplary definitions of the term "rectifier" and an exemplary discussion of signal rectification are attached herein as Appendix A. As these references demonstrate, rectification involves conversion of an alternating current (AC) signal to some form of a direct current (DC) signal, such as by half-wave rectification or full-wave rectification. The output of a typical rectifier is a pulsing DC signal or a constant DC signal. Thus, the Office's interpretation of the claim terms "rectifier" and "rectified signal" are

inconsistent with their ordinary and customary meanings, as well as inconsistent with the disclosure of the above-identified application.

As illustrated by FIG. 1 of Nakamiya, the signals VD(t), S1, and S2 are all downstream in the signal path of the switching element 30. As illustrated in FIG. 2., all of these signals comprise AC signals and therefore one of ordinary skill in the art would not consider the output of the element 30 to be a rectified signal. Thus, the switching element 30 is not a rectifier and does not provide a rectified signal, provided by claim 1. Therefore, Nakamiya fails to disclose each and every element of claim 1.

Claims 2-4 and 12 depend from claim 1. Accordingly, Nakamiya fails to disclose each and every element of these claims, at least by virtue of their dependency on claim 1. In addition, these claims recite additional non-obvious features.

With respect to claim 16, the claim recites "monitoring within a System On a Chip (SOC) device an oscillation output of a signal controlled oscillator of the SOC device to determine an operating condition of the signal controlled oscillator." As explained in Applicants' Response To Office Action of October 27, 2005, this element is not disclosed or suggested by Nakamiya. Nakamiya nowhere discloses or suggests a system on a chip. Further, FIG. 1 of Nakamiya indicates that the circuit 60 is located separately from other elements of the system. The Office Action ignores Applicant's argument, and does not identify or cite any portion of Nakamiya that discloses an SOC. Accordingly, the Office Action fails to establish that Nakamiya discloses each and every element of claim 16 as required by § 102.

Claims 17-18 and 24-25 depend from claim 16. Accordingly, Nakamiya fails to disclose each and every element of these claims, at least by virtue of their dependency on claim 16. In addition, these claims recite additional non-obvious features.

With respect to claim 26, the Office Action indicates at page 2 that the claim is rejected based on Nakamiya. However, as pointed out by Applicant in the Response To Office Action of October 27, 2005, no reasons for the rejection have been set forth by the Examiner in either the present Office Action or the Office Action of August 1, 2005. Accordingly, the Examiner has

failed to establish a prima facie case that Nakamiya discloses or suggests each and every element of claim 26.

In view of the forgoing, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 1-4, 12, 16-18, and 24-26 is improper. Withdrawal of this rejection and reconsideration of the claims therefore is respectfully requested.

Obviousness Rejection of Claims 13-15

At page 2 of the Office Action, claims 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Namakiya in view of Heinonen (U.S. Application Publication No. 2003/0060176). This rejection is hereby respectfully traversed.

Claims 13-15 depend from claim 1. As explained above, Nakamiya does not disclose each and every element of claim 1. Accordingly, Accordingly, Nakamiya fails to disclose each and every element of claims 13-15, at least by virtue of their dependency on claim 1. Further, Heinonen fails to disclose the elements that are lacking in Nakamiya. Accordingly, Nakamiya and Heinonen, individually and in combination, fail to disclose or suggest each and every element of claims 13-15. For at least this reason a prima facie rejection of claims 13-15 under § 103 has not been made.

In view of the forgoing, it is respectfully submitted that the obviousness rejection of claims 13-15 is improper. Withdrawal of this rejection and reconsideration of the claims therefore is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

The Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance, and an early indication of the same is courteously solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone at the below listed telephone number in order to expedite resolution of any issues and to expedite passage of the present application to issue, if any comments, questions, or suggestions arise in connection with the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees that may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account Number 50-2469.

Respectfully submitted,

2/24/06
Date

Adam D. Sheehan; Reg. No. 42,146
TOLER, LARSON & ABEL, L.L.P.
5000 Plaza On The Lake, Suite 265
Austin, Texas 78746
(512) 327-5515 (phone)
(512) 327-5452 (fax)